



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Book Reviews

God's Image in Man and Its Defacement in the Light of Modern Ideals. BY JAMES ORR. London: Hodder and Stoughton; New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1905. Pp. xv + 325. \$1.75.

This volume contains the "Stone Lectures" delivered by Professor Orr at the Princeton Theological Seminary in the autumn of 1903, with copious foot-notes and additional notes at the end of the book. The aim of the lecturer is to defend what he regards as the Christian view of the world against modern evolutionism. The Christian view is to him that which is embodied in the general Calvinistic doctrinal system, which, again, is unhesitatingly identified with the biblical. By "biblical" is apparently meant, that which is expressed in any part of the Bible, and accordingly in harmony with every other part. This "biblical view" of the universe is regarded as essential to that "Gospel system" of truth expressed in the doctrines of the incarnation, the atonement, regeneration, resurrection, and immortal life. These maintain their ground only when it is granted that man was "directly" created by God and did not rise gradually out of lower orders of existence by inherent potentialities; that man at the outset possessed God-like moral purity; that this purity was lost by wilful violation of statutory divine law on the part of the first man; that the consequent moral impurity was propagated by physical generation through the entire race, infants included; and that physical death is a consequence.

Professor Orr does not reject evolution entirely, but that form of it which is known as Darwinism. He says: "No religious interest, I may take it for granted, is imperilled by a theory of evolution viewed simply as a method of creation, provided certain conditions are fulfilled and certain limits observed." The limitations imposed are substantially, first, that man did not arise gradually out of the lower orders of life; second, that the history of man is not that of a gradual rise out of childlike innocence or a non-moral condition with only moral potentialities into a life of high moral actuality. In fact a careful reading of the lectures will show that Orr himself is deeply influenced by that time-spirit in which the conception of evolution is so powerfully at work.

His arguments against Darwinism may be fairly embraced under three heads, the scientific contention, the theological contention, and the moral contention. In the first of these he presents the contradictions among

scientists, quotes scientific testimony of the highest standing to show that the immense period of time required by the Darwinian hypothesis for the origin of man by insensible gradations is not allowed by geology and palæontology, and that the most ancient human skulls indicate the possession of mental faculties equal to our own. The "missing links" are not found nor likely to be found. There are immense strides or "jumps" in the stages of animate existence, inexplicable except on the ground that some power not inherent in nature and, like that manifested in miracles, struck out by direct creative acts these new forms of life.

This brings us to the theological argument, which is not merely that the explanation of the phenomena of the universe is not to be found in the universe itself, but rather in an intelligence working toward an end. This would be the view most in accord with thoroughgoing evolutionism. The author argues from the point of view, not of the end, but of the beginning of things. Man cannot be "accounted for by unaided evolution," or "unaided natural selection;" "the direct act of God" is necessary to explain the facts. In such an act nature is not said to be ignored, but the supernatural comes in at certain points to "aid" the natural. God is the supernatural factor without which the new forms could not be accounted for.

I should like to say at this point that I do not see what satisfaction the Christian thinker can find in these "jumps" in the rise of natural organisms. If such breaks in the continuity of series make room for God as an aid in the explanation of nature, it can be so only in case God be excluded from the continuous series. If God be the theological equivalent of the accidental or the extraordinary in science, then we are led to conceive the orderly progress of things as independent of God, and with the growing discovery of the subjection of things to natural law the sphere of the divine will become more and more limited and its reality continually endangered. But, indeed, the lack of orderly and fixed connection of events is as much out of accord with Christian theism as it is with evolutionism. The dualism which, unfortunately, runs all through Orr's book is at the root of most of the difficulty which theology finds in modern science. But may not absolute confidence, on the one hand, in the scientific idea of the unity of nature and the perfect causal coherency of its phenomena and, on the other hand, absolute devotion to the religious ideal (God) which is the final explanation of nature, coexist in the same human mind?

The moral argument is twofold: first, the bringing of man into existence in a low moral or non-moral state is out of keeping with the Gospel teaching of the Fatherhood of God; second, the evolutionist theory of

sin is offensive to our moral conscience because it regards man as morally *immature*, rather than as morally *wrong*. But Professor Orr must acknowledge that the same difficulty meets every theory which attempts to account for the presence of sin in a world ruled by a good God, and particularly the Calvinistic theory of "divine decrees."

There are a good many instances of a confused or ambiguous use of terms and of inconsequential reasoning in the book. One or two instances are given herewith. Referring (p. 198) to the divine pronouncement of the creation, when completed in man, as "very good," the author argues. "But if man was made good, and now is evil, the inference is irresistible that he has become so by voluntary departure from rectitude." The first use of the term "good" is in a non-moral sense, else we should have to attribute moral qualities of God-like nature to all the animals in the creation and all the material bodies (see first chapter of Genesis); while the second use of the word "good," as contrasted with (moral) evil, is equivalent to moral rectitude or purity. And as to the inference mentioned, its irresistibility is not evident. The natural inference would rather be that for such a being as Professor Orr describes a *voluntary* transgression would be impossible.

Again, in Lecture V, after describing original sin in the darkest colors, and, in this connection, treating highly rhetorical language of Scripture as descriptive of literal fact, the author admits that "man retains many traces of the divine image . . . in traits of character pleasing and praiseworthy in themselves." Man is "capable of exhibiting many virtues" and has "still in his heart an inextinguishable longing after God" (p. 245). Is all this "evil" and not "good"?

There can be no question of Professor Orr's deep religious interest, his courage, his marvelous grasp of the material of present-day learning, and his perception of the seriousness of the questions now pressing for solution; but I do not think that the work under review can give much help to a man who is seized of the significance of the great intellectual and religious movements of the present and feels a sympathetic interest in them.

GEORGE CROSS

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Toronto, Canada